

REMARKS

In the advisory action dated August 28, 2006, the Examiner states that claims remain rejected because the specification fails to provide support for the “first and second solid surface.” The Examiner also states that paragraph [0034] does not recite “....discriminates between the surfactant monolayer and the first geometric shape.” The Examiner also requests that applicants point out where the specification supports steps b and c.

Paragraph [0027] and [0028] discloses using both positive and negative affinity geometries to screen for peptides. As explained in these paragraphs, positive affinity is used to select desired peptides and negative affinity is used to remove unwanted peptides. The first solid surface corresponds to a positive affinity surface and the second solid surface in step b) corresponds to a negative affinity surface as described in these paragraphs.

The Examiner states that the recitation “....discriminates between the surfactant monolayer and the first geometric shape” is not disclosed in paragraph [0034]. Paragraph [0034] states “The methods disclosed herein provide the advantage that the interdependence of the two binding events, one to the surface and the other to already bound surfactants, can be controlled though selective pressure for either. Accordingly, in certain aspects, the surface used for a method for identifying a peptide disclosed herein is composed at least in part, or is bound by, a surfactant. An identified phage expressing a surface-binding peptide can bind to the surfactant or to both the surface and the surfactant. Alternatively, the surfactant, for example, can be a monolayer that covers the surface such that peptides expressed on the phage bind to the surfactant but cannot bind to the surface.” Accordingly, this section describes selectively pressuring the peptide to bind to either the surfactant monolayer or the geometric surface. By pressuring the peptide to bind to one surface or the other, the peptide is discriminating between the two surfaces as claimed.

Step b recites “contacting a second solid surface comprising the self-assembled surfactant monolayer and comprising a second geometrical shape with phage that bind to the first surface,

wherein phage that bind to the second surface are excluded, and wherein the non-binding phage are recontacted with the first surface.” As stated above, the second solid surface corresponds to the negative affinity geometry as disclosed in paragraphs [0027] and [0028], which describes excluding peptides that bind to the negative affinity surface. Re-contacting the phage with the first positive affinity surface is disclosed in [0028], which states that “Phage that do not bind the surface with the undesirable geometrical shape and/or atomic configuration, are collected and optionally amplified and subjected to additional rounds of biopanning.” Step “c) repeating step (b)” is also disclosed in paragraph [0028], which states that “[t]he rounds of selection and removal can be repeated to increase the binding strength and/or specificity of identified phage.” Accordingly, for the reasons described above and for the reasons stated in the response filed on August 11, 2006, all of the claimed limitations are supported by the specification as filed.

Further, for the reasons stated above and in the response filed on August 11, 2006, all of the pending rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. **070702005900.**

Dated: December 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7769